



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
ONE MAIN STREET, SUITE 1100
CAMBRIDGE MA 02142

COPY MAILED

AUG 26 2008

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------|
| In re Application of | : | |
| G. Stephen Legraw | : | |
| Application No. 09/754,492 | : | ON PETITION |
| Filed: January 4, 2001 | : | |
| Attorney Docket No. S144.101.102 | : | |

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed October 30, 2007, to revive the above-identified application, with a supplemental petition filed July 25, 2008..

The petition is **GRANTED**.

This application became abandoned as a result of petitioner's failure to file an appeal brief (and fee required by 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2)) within the time period provided in 37 CFR 41.37(a)(1). As an appeal brief (and appeal brief fee) was not filed within two (2) months of the Notice of Appeal filed December 5, 2006, and no extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained, the appeal was dismissed and the proceedings as to the rejected claims were terminated. See 37 CFR 1.197(b). As no claim was allowed, the application became abandoned on February 6, 2007. See MPEP 1215.04.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), fee of \$810, and the submission required by 37 CFR 1.114; (2) the petition fee of \$770; and (3) an adequate statement of unintentional delay.

37 CFR 1.137(b)(3) requires a statement that "the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional." Since the statement appearing in the petition varies from the language required by 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3), the statement is being construed as the required statement. Petitioner must notify the Office if this is not a correct reading of the statement appearing in the petition.

It is not apparent whether the person signing the statement of unintentional delay was in a position to have firsthand or direct knowledge of the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue. Nevertheless, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and circumstances of such delay. See 37 CFR 10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997). In the event that such an inquiry has not been made, petitioner must make such an inquiry. If such inquiry results in the discovery that it is not correct that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

There is no indication that the person signing the petition was ever given a power of attorney to prosecute the application. If the person signing the petition desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney document must be submitted. While a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the petition, all future correspondence will be directed to the address currently of record until appropriate instructions are received.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Terri Williams at (571) 272-2991.

The application file is being referred to Technology Center AU 3692 for appropriate action on the concurrently filed RCE and amendment.



Chris Bottorff
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions

cc: **G. Stephen LeGraw**
DICKE, BILLIG, & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402